

IN THE SPECIFICATION

The objections to the specification by the Examiner are noted. The following amendments have been made to the specification:

On page 3, lines 1 - 19, please amend the specification as follows:

Another known type of HARQ technique is an Incremental Redundancy (“IR”) protocol. The IR protocol involves the formation of IR sub-packets from coded bit stream derived from one or more blocks of information. Here, in the event of an erroneous reception, the transmitter sends new sub-packets that ~~constitutes~~ constitute additional redundancy parity bits to the receiver to improve the signal detection process. The receiving equipment attempts to decode the additionally transmitted IR sub-packet(s) in combination with earlier transmission(s) of the original IR sub-packet containing the same user information. Thusly, retransmitted IR sub-packets are not repetitions of the previously transmitted IR sub-packet(s), in contrast with the Chase protocol. Decoding the combination of retransmitted IR sub-packets with the original IR sub-packet may reduce the number of retransmissions required to successfully receive the transmitted information.

On page 9, lines 7 - 13, please amend the specification as follows:

If, however, the transmitting equipment receives an NACK, the HARQ technique is used for the re-transmissions. If Chase protocol is employed, then the same Chase packet is retransmitted. Consequently, the receiver in combination with the previously received failed transmission(s) decodes each received Chase packet. Similarly IR protocol may also be employed (60). For the

purposes of the present disclosure, a Chase function and an IR function each refer to the application of a Chase or IR protocol, respectively.

On page 11, line 21 – page 12, line 3, please amend the specification as follows:

If, on the other hand, a NACK is sent, the failed error coded streams (for example, failing a cyclic redundancy check) are processed according to the protocol employed, and the receiving equipment waits for the next error coded streams to be transmitted and received. Thusly, if one or more of the failed error coded streams comprises a Chase protocol, then the failed Chase packet(s) is combined with the next received Chase packet(s) (50) corresponding with that failed error coded stream(s), as sent by the transmitting equipment in response to the NACK. Similarly, if one or more of the failed error coded streams comprises an IR protocol, then the failed IR sub-packet (s) is stored and combined with the next received IR sub-packet(s) (60) corresponding with that failed error coded bit stream(s), as sent by the transmitting equipment in response to the NACK.

On page 12, line 12 – page 13, line 2, please amend the specification as follows:

In response to performing this independent cyclic redundancy checking, a confirmation message is sent (130) for each error coded stream. If one or more error coded streams pass their independent cyclic redundancy checking step, an ACK message is sent (140) by the receiving equipment for that error coded stream(s). In contrast, a NACK message is sent (150) by the receiving equipment for each error coded ~~streams~~ stream failing its independent cyclic redundancy checking step. For each NACK message sent, the corresponding failed error

coded stream is processed according to the protocol employed, and, thereafter, the receiving equipment waits for the next error coded bit streams to be received. If one or more of the failed error coded bit streams comprises a Chase protocol packet(s), then the failed Chase packet(s) is combined with the next received Chase packet(s) (160) corresponding with that failed error coded stream(s), as sent by the transmitting equipment in response to the NACK. Similarly, if one or more of failed error coded streams comprises an IR protocol, then the failed IR sub-packet(s) is stored and combined with the next received IR sub-packet(s) (170) corresponding with that failed error coded stream(s), as sent by the transmitting equipment in response to the NACK.

With regard to the Examiner's objections to the specification on page 11, in lines 1-2, Applicants respectfully request that the independent error detection step is intended for the embodiment shown in figure 4. That is, on page 10, line 28, Applicants describe the embodiments shown in figures 3 and 4 together for brevity. In this manner, unnecessary repetition of details in the Applicants' Specification are avoided. In particular, on page 10, line 28, in the Applicant's specification reads "As will be detailed hereinbelow in association with Figs. 3 and 4, this independent error detection step may be implemented using number of distinct architectures." In this manner, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.